



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,370	05/18/2006	Martin Gosling	2003P05858WOUS	3637
7590	08/10/2009		EXAMINER	
Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			SAETHER, FLEMMING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3677	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/559,370	GOSLING, MARTIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Flemming Saether	3677	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 19-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22,25 and 27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 19-21,23,26,28 and 34 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/6/2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of species B, 2 in the reply filed on 6/1/2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on many grounds, generally that the reason for the restriction are merely conclusionary statement and not presumably specific to the instant application. This is not found persuasive because the rational set for in the restriction requirement when considered in totality place an undue burden on the examiner. Specifically, a species restriction does not do not require separate search areas the consideration of the different embodiment is sufficient burden and if applicant feels that applied art found would be applicable to other species applicant is welcome to suggest such rejections or, if applicant feels that species are obvious applicant can put forth evidence to that as well.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 22, 25 and 27 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there currently being no allowable generic or linking claim. In regards to claim 22, applicant indicates it reads on the elected species (Fig. 10) however, a review of the embodiment of Fig. 10 shows that in Fig. 10 there are different pressures (page 16, 6 lines up from the bottom) whereas claim 22 requires the same pressure.

Applicant is reminded that once a generic claim is found allowable all those claims dependent therefrom will in turn also be allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 19-21, 23-24, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is not described how there would be only a radial force with on axial component (claim 1, line 9-10) because since there are axial components to the fluid passageway there inherently would be at least some axial components to the force applied as well.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 19-21, 26 and 28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 and 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,840,726 and 7,066,699 respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are broader than those of the parents and wherein the claims of the patents include at least all the all the features claimed in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 19-21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fredriksson (US 3,947,948). Fredriksson discloses a tensioning apparatus comprising a shank member (4); an annular member (2) having an inside surface parallel to the shank member for an interference fit on the shank member; a fluid passageway (10) in the shank member with longitudinal and transverse channels for delivering a fluid to generate only a radial force to relax the interference fit and; a tensioner (21-24) for

pulling on the shank including a piston connected to the shank and a cylinder (23) connected to the annular member.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fredriksson as applied to claims 19 and 20 above, and further in view of Spies (US 4,905,777). Fredriksson is not specific as to the pressure source. Spies discloses a pressure source comprising a pressure converter (52) having water and oil as the working fluids (column 7, paragraph beginning line 33). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use as the pressure source in Fredriksson water and oil with a pressure converter as disclosed in Spies because the pressure converter conveniently allows for the pressure control of two separate pressure devices with separate fluids which would have been recognized as advantageous on Fredriksson since there are two pressure devices which could benefit from separate fluids and which operate as constant relative pressures. The selection of the material would have been obvious so that the device would be optimized for a particular application.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Flemming Saether whose telephone number is 571-272-7071. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Victor Batson can be reached on 571-272-6987. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Flemming Saether
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3677

/Flemming Saether/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3677